

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**319th AIR REFUELING WING
GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA
TEMPORARY USE OF
FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON**



Prepared by:

**92 CES/CEV
100 W Ent Street, Suite 155
Fairchild AFB WA 99011-9688**

March 2005

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE MAR 2005		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2005 to 00-00-2005	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Environmental Assessment and Finding No Significant Impact: 319th Air Refueling Wing Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota Temporary Use of Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 92nd Civil Engineer Squadron (92 CES/CEV), 100 W Ent Street, Suite 155, Fairchild AFB, WA, 99011				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 21	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

92d AIR REFUELING WING GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON TEMPORARY USE OF FAIRCHILD AIR RESERVE BASE, WASHINGTON

Federal actions that potentially involve significant impacts to the environment must be reviewed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and all other applicable environmental laws. This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared following careful evaluation of the anticipated environmental consequences of the Proposed Action.

Proposed Action

It is proposed to move approximately 20 KC-135R/T aircraft, 425 personnel, associated vehicles and maintenance equipment to Fairchild AFB during the period that Grand Forks AFB's runway is closed due to construction. The proposed time period is 1 May 2005 to 1 November 2005.

Description of the Proposed Action

Grand Forks AFB will rebuild the existing runway from 1 May to 1 November 2005. The runway will be closed for the entire construction period. An alternative runway must be identified for existing aircraft.

To continue providing aircraft and mission support forces to Air Mobility Command, 20 KC-135R/T aircraft will be temporarily relocated to Fairchild AFB (FAFB). Normal operations will disperse a limited number of aircraft to other USAF bases for the duration of the runway closure. Approximately 425 personnel will be temporarily deployed to FAFB, with a portion of the personnel billeted on base.

FAFB will become the main operating base for 319th ARW aircraft and crews during the runway closure period. Normal operations to be conducted at FAFB include aircraft maintenance, which will be accomplished in existing maintenance facilities, and aircraft sorties, which will be planned and executed by GFAFB personnel in coordination with FAFB personnel.

Aircraft sorties conducted at FAFB will include, but are not limited to takeoffs, landings, pattern work, and other training needs. No construction or similar ground disturbing activities will occur as a result of these actions. Only existing facilities and ramp space will be used.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Alternative A: Disperse aircraft to other bases such as Minot AFB North Dakota, McConnell AFB Kansas, or MacDill AFB Florida. These bases either do not have the ramp space available and/or the infrastructure in place to support the mission, or are far enough removed from the normal service area so as to hinder the mission of the 319th ARW.

Alternative C: No Action Alternative

Anticipated Environmental Effects

The proposed action (Preferred Alternative) to deploy of 20 KC-135 aircraft from GFAFB to FAFB and Alternatives to the Proposed Action have been reviewed in accordance with NEPA as implemented by the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality and AFI 32-7061.

Baseline environmental conditions at FAFB have been addressed and the environmental consequences on implementing the proposed action have been evaluated. The Preferred Alternative would not significantly affect the environmental conditions at FAFB and surrounding regions.

Air Quality: Existing air permit thresholds for pollutants would not be exceeded if the proposed action is implemented. Additional air pollution would be minimal with the proposed alternative.

Noise: 319th ARW aircraft deployed to Fairchild AFB will be a maximum of 20 KC-135R/Ts. Aircrews from GFAFB will follow same approach, departure, and pattern procedures as those currently established for FAFB. Other training may occur on and/or off site. Total sorties and noise impacts will be minimal when compared against the current AICUZ plan.

Hazardous Materials/Waste: All hazardous materials will be obtained from the FAFB Hazardous Materials Pharmacy. This will allow tracking of all hazardous material. All hazardous waste collection and disposal will be carried out per Federal and state regulations, and Fairchild AFB Instruction. There would be a minimal increase in hazardous material use and hazardous waste generation as a result of the proposed alternative.

Socioeconomics: The proposed temporary relocation of aircraft from Grand Forks AFB would result in a positive impact on the local economy in the vicinity of FAFB. The total number of personnel to be temporarily relocated to FAFB under this action is 425; beneficial economic impacts would be the result.

Short-term beneficial impacts would result from the temporary personnel patronage of local services. Although some Personnel will acquire lodging on base, most will depend upon a variety of retail businesses both on base and off.

Airfield/Airspace Operations: The additional sorties flown per the proposed alternative would have minimal impact on current operations. The addition of 20 KC-135 aircraft and the training/mission requirements of those aircraft and crews could be easily integrated into current FAFB operations.

Safety and Occupational Health: The proposed temporary relocation of aircraft from GFAFB would not result in a negative impact on safety and health of FAFB personnel. GFAFB will deploy to FAFB maintenance personnel for their aircraft.

Environmental Management: The proposed temporary relocation of aircraft from GFAFB would produce additional solid waste and recyclable material. GFAFB will be required to follow FAFB procedures to minimize use of hazardous materials and hazardous waste generation. GFAFB personnel will participate in FAFB recycling programs to minimize the amount of solid waste disposal.

Environmental Justice: The proposed project would have beneficial economic impacts on the surrounding community. There are no minority or low-income populations in the area of the proposed actions or alternatives, and thus, there will be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts on such population. In compliance with Executive Order 12989 (Section 4.7), the alternatives considered for this EA do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts: There are no site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with a temporary relocation of aircraft from Grand Forks AFB to FAFB.

Availability

A copy of the Final EA is available from:

92d ARW/PA
1 E Bong St
Fairchild AFB, WA 99011
(509) 247-5704

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the attached environmental assessment conducted in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ Regulations, and AFI 32-7061, I conclude that the agency preferred alternative, temporary deployment of aircraft from Grand Forks Air Force Base to Fairchild Air Reserve Base, will have no significant individual or cumulative impacts upon the environment. An environmental impact statement is not warranted and one will not be prepared. Public notice was given in the local media and distribution of the environmental assessment to local agencies with a thirty-day comment period. The signing of this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) completes the environmental impact analysis process under Air Force regulations.

APPROVED BY:


 18 Apr 05
RONALD R. DANIELS
Deputy Base Civil Engineer
92 Civil Engineer Squadron
Fairchild Air Force Base, WA 99011
(509) 247-2291

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction.....	5
1.2 Need for Action.....	5
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Scope of EA	5
1.5 Decision Needed	5
1.6 Applicable Regulatory Requirements	6

Chapter 2.0 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Selection Criteria	7
2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated	7
2.4 Description of Proposed Alternatives	7
2.5 Identification of Preferred Alternative.....	8

Chapter 3.0 Affected Environment

3.1 Introduction.....	8
3.2 Air Quality	8
3.3 Noise	8
3.4 Wastes and Hazardous Materials	8
3.5 Socioeconomic Resources	9
3.6 Airspace/Airfield Operations	9
3.7 Safety and Occupational Health.....	11
3.8 Environmental Management (Pollution Prevention)	11
3.9 Environmental Justice.....	11
3.10 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	11

Chapter 4.0 Environmental Consequences

4.1 Introduction.....	11
4.2 Air Quality	11
4.2.1 Proposed Action.....	11
4.2.2 No-action Alternative.....	12
4.3 Noise	12
4.3.1 Proposed Action.....	12
4.3.2 No-action Alternative.....	12

4.4 Wastes, Hazardous Materials.....	13
4.4.1 Proposed Action.....	13
4.4.2 No-action Alternative.....	13
4.5 Socioeconomic.....	13
4.5.1 Proposed Action.....	13
4.5.2 No-action Alternative.....	13
4.6 Airspace/Airfield Operations.....	13
4.6.1 Proposed Action.....	13
4.6.2 No-action Alternative.....	14
4.7 Safety and Occupational Health.....	14
4.7.1 Proposed Action.....	14
4.7.2 No-action Alternative.....	14
4.8 Environmental Management (Pollution Prevention)	14
4.8.1 Proposed Action.....	14
4.8.2 No-action Alternative.....	14
4.9 Environmental Justice	15
4.9.1 Proposed Action.....	15
4.9.2 No-action Alternative.....	15
4.10 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	15
4.10.1 Proposed Action.....	15
4.10.2 No-action Alternative.....	15
Chapter 5.0 List of Preparers	16
Chapter 6.0 List of Persons and Agencies Consulted and/or Provided Copies.....	16
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	4

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone
ARW	Air Refueling Wing
CAA	Clean Air Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
DRMO	Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FAFB	Fairchild Air Force Base
GFAFB	Grand Forks Air Force Base
IAP	International Air Port
MSL	Mean Sea Level
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priority Listing
PM	Particulate Matter
POV	Privately Owned Vehicle
PPA	Pollution Prevention Act
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
TSD	Treatment, Storage and Disposal
USAF	United States Air Force

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
319th AIR REFUELING WING
GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA
TEMPORARY USE OF
FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON

1. Purpose and Need for Action:

1.1 Introduction

Grand Forks AFB (GFAFB), ND proposes to deploy aircraft and associated personnel and equipment assigned to the 319th Air Refueling Wing (ARW) while their runway is closed for repair from 1 May 05 through 1 November 05.

1.2 Need for Action

The runway at GFAFB needs extensive repair in order to continue safe operations and must be closed during a period of 1 May 2005 to 1 Nov 2005. Approximately \$27M has been appropriated for the repairs and a contract has been signed to complete the project. The contract requires that the runway be closed on 1 May 05. Before that date, aircraft, personnel, and associated support equipment must be transferred to a new location.

1.3 Objectives for the Action

In order to continue its mission, the 319th ARW must operate from an alternative location while the runway at GFAFB is shut down. The objective of this action is to identify an alternative runway location that possesses the necessary facilities and infrastructure to adequately support the 319th ARW during its stay. The new location must provide a safe and economical environment for approximately 20 KC-135R aircraft, 425 personnel, and associated support equipment during the six-month runway closure period.

1.4 Scope of EA

This EA will assess, to the fullest extent possible, the environmental consequences of the proposed alternatives on the affected environment.

1.5 Decision Needed

This document is intended to evaluate whether the proposed action (PA) will result in environmental impact significant enough to warrant preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or whether the action will qualify for a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

1.6 Applicable Regulatory Requirements

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended

NEPA requires all Federal agencies to use a systematic approach when assessing the environmental impacts of government activities. Compliance with NEPA is accomplished through the guidance outlined in 32 CFR 989.

Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 91-204)

The CAA requires that all Federal agencies comply with Federal, State or local requirements with respect to the control and abatement of air quality.

Executive Order 12989, Environmental Equity

Federal Actions to “Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” directs Federal agencies to address environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities. The general purposes of this Executive Order are:

- To focus attention of Federal agencies on the human health and environmental conditions in minority communities and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice;
- To foster non-discrimination in Federal programs that substantially affect human health or the environment; and
- To give minority communities and low-income communities greater opportunities for public participation in and access to public information on matters relating to human health and the environment.

Pollution Prevention Act of 1990; Executive Order 12856; Executive Order 12902

Regulatory mandates for pollution prevention are outlined in the PPA of 1990. Right-to-Know laws and pollution prevention requirements are outlined in E.O. 12856. E.O. 12902 outlines the requirements for energy efficiency and waste conservation at federal facilities.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (40 CFR parts 260-270)

The storage, handling, recycling, and disposal of hazardous wastes are subject to regulations under the RCRA act of 1976 and its 1988 amendments.

2. Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

The proposed action is required to enable the 319th ARW to continue its mission. The proposal involves the relocation of approximately 20 KC-135R aircraft, personnel, and support equipment during a six-month period while the runway at GFARB is closed for

repair. The new location must provide adequate facilities and infrastructure to support 20 aircraft and associated personnel and equipment.

2.2 Selection Criteria for Alternatives

The alternatives must consider the following mission requirements including safety, cost effectiveness, efficiency and the ability to continue the training and wartime mission. Additional environmental criteria considered must include air quality, noise, hazardous waste and material, safety and socioeconomic resources.

2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from detailed Study

A number of alternatives were considered but eliminated for various reasons. One alternative considered but eliminated was the deployment of the 319th ARW to Minot AFB, ND. A second alternative considered but eliminated was the deployment of the 319th ARW to MacDill AFB, FL. These two alternatives were eliminated due to a number of reasons including, but not limited to 1. insufficient availability of ramp space for parking aircraft, 2. a lack of infrastructure in place to support the mission requirements, and 3. distance from the 319th ARW service area.

2.4 Description of Proposed Alternatives

Alternative A, the preferred alternative, provides for the movement of approximately twenty KC-135R aircraft and associated support equipment, and 425 personnel to Fairchild AFB (FAFB), WA during the period of 1 May 05 to 1 Nov 05. FAFB will become the main operating base for 319th ARW aircraft and crews during the runway closure period. Shortly before the runway closes, approximately 20 KC-135R aircraft will be flown to FAFB. The deployment will include 425 personnel and support equipment associated with operating 20 KC-135R aircraft. Normal operations to be conducted at FAFB include aircraft maintenance, which will be accomplished in existing maintenance facilities. Aircraft sorties will include, but are not limited to takeoffs, landings, pattern work, and other training needs. Only existing facilities and ramp space will be used. Approximately 30 sorties will be flown per week, averaging about eight hours per sortie. Flight path and altitude getting to and departing from FAFB will be the published approaches and departures for FAFB. GFAFB refueling sorties will use the same refueling tracks that are flown now. Aircraft will have no special maintenance requirements and no construction or similar ground disturbing activities will occur as a result of these actions.

The No-action Alternative is to close the runway for repairs and leave the aircraft parked on GFAFB ramp space. Once the contractor begins to repair the runway, the decision to park the aircraft would not be reversible. Any event, such as a widening of the global war on terrorism (GWOT), would carry on without these vital national security assets.

2.5 Preferred Alternative

The preferred alternative provides for the movement of approximately twenty KC-135R aircraft, 425 personnel, and associated support equipment, FAFB during the period of 1 May 05 to 1 Nov 05.

3.0 Affected Environment

3.1 Introduction

Fairchild AFB is home to the 92nd ARW and operates 41 assigned KC-135 aircraft and 65 aircrews to provide rapid and reliable air refueling of fighter, bomber and airlift aircraft for global contingency and conventional operations, USSTRATCOM OPLAN 8044, as well as passenger and cargo airlift. Tenant organizations at FAFB include the 336th Training Group (Survival School), 36th Rescue Flight, 141st ARW, and 2nd Support Squadron (Air Combat Command).

The following sections will describe the identified affected environment that will be evaluated for environmental consequences associated with the proposed action and alternative.

3.2 Air Quality

The regional temperature regime and wind patterns affect ambient air quality in the vicinity of FAFB. Winds generally transport air pollutants eastward toward the Spokane valley areas; that allow for increased accumulation of air pollutants. During winter months many neighborhoods use wood burning stoves for heat, and with the increased carbon monoxide (CO) levels from vehicles operating under cold temperatures, the air quality can significantly decrease. Temperature inversions are another factor affecting air quality in the vicinity of FAFB.

The existing levels of ambient air quality and historical trends are documented by the Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority (SCAPCA). Air quality in the Spokane area is characterized air-monitoring stations. The monitoring stations measure pollutants including CO, particulate matter (PM) and are located at various locations.

Of the six criteria pollutants identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), three are of concern in the Spokane region including CO, PM, and ozone. Motor vehicles are the largest contributors to CO with the highest concentrations occurring during the winter months. PM comes from a variety of sources including dust from unpaved and paved roadways, construction activities, gas and diesel engines, and indoor/outdoor burning. The largest contributor to ozone is vehicles (nearly two-thirds), but other sources include industrial solvents, gasoline refueling, dry cleaning, and auto body paint shops.

3.3 Noise

Aircraft operations are the primary sources of noise at FAFB. Noise from aircraft engine run-up, landing, and takeoff occur mainly during normal business hours, from 0700 to 1700. Additional sources of noise that occur on FAFB during periods of no flying or maintenance operations include construction activity and ground traffic movement. This noise is comparable to sounds that occur in typical communities and it is only during periods of aircraft activity that the ambient noise level environment changes. Land use in the vicinity of FAFB is primarily used for agriculture.

3.4 Wastes and Hazardous Materials

Hazardous wastes generated at FAFB include flammable solvents, contaminated solids, stripping chemicals, used oils, waste paint-related materials, and other miscellaneous items. Approximately 75 percent of wastes are generated from aircraft maintenance activities, 10 percent from motor vehicle maintenance activities, 10 percent from civil engineering activities, and 5 percent from other sources.

Hazardous waste is kept at satellite accumulation points until it is delivered to the Hazardous Waste Facility. Wastes are logged in and manifested for transport off the base to a certified Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) facility within 90 days of the accumulation start date. FAFB disposes of hazardous waste in coordination with the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO). The DRMO prepares the appropriate paperwork and arranges for a licensed Contractor to remove and dispose of the hazardous waste at an approved TSD.

Hazardous and toxic material procurements on FAFB are approved and tracked by the appropriate members of the HMMP team. Base Supply personnel receive, inspect, distribute, and track hazardous materials. In 1996, a "pharmacy" system for the distribution of hazardous materials was implemented at FAFB. The purpose of the pharmacy system is to minimize and control the use of hazardous materials in order to minimize the generation of hazardous wastes. In addition, current inventories of hazardous materials are assessed to determine if less-toxic alternatives exist. Bench stock quantities of materials are distributed to authorized recipients on an as needed basis. Any unused portions of the hazardous materials are returned to the issue point to be made available for other users.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) classifies FAFB as a large quantity generator based on the total volume of hazardous waste generated. The 92 CES/CEV, Environmental Flight, oversees hazardous waste management within the Cantonment Area of FAFB in compliance with the Fairchild Hazardous Waste Management Plan (2004). This plan addresses the proper identification, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous waste at FAFB.

3.5 Socioeconomic Resources

FAFB is located near Spokane, WA which has a population of approximately 195,629, with the estimated population of Spokane County at 417,939 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Increases in population in the region are on average over 10 percent, but below the statewide average of 21 percent.

Major industries in the Spokane area include construction and mining, manufacturing, transportation, communications and utilities, finance, and health care research and delivery. FAFB is the largest employer in the Inland Northwest and employs approximately 5,400 military and civilian employees. The annual payroll of FAFB is approximately \$203 million and it is estimated that FAFB indirectly creates an additional 2,150 jobs and \$82 million in payroll from support jobs throughout the community.

3.6 Airspace/Airfield Operations

Currently, FAFB provides support for approximately 118 daily aircraft operations, which includes departures, arrivals, and closed pattern flight tracks. These flight tracks have been configured to minimize noise impacts to the local community while maintaining flight safety standards.

The airfield at FAFB, which is adjacent to Spokane International Airport, is encompassed by Class C airspace up to 64,000 MSL. Class C airspace is controlled airspace that extends from the surface to a specified higher altitude, and is designed and implemented to provide additional air traffic control into and out of primary airports where aircraft operations are periodically at high density levels, such as FAFB. Although FAFB has its own Air traffic Control (ATC) personnel, FAFB works closely with Spokane IAP to ensure aircraft separation services for instrument and visual flight rules aircraft in the vicinity of FAFB. ATC services within FAFB Class C airspace are provided by the FAFB control tower.

3.7 Safety and Occupational Health

There are no major safety and occupational health issues associated with this move. The increased traffic load of 400+ TDY personnel moving on and off base daily is not a strain on our roadway system. TDY personnel will have to comply with the same Federal and Air Force Standards that their permanent party counterparts at Fairchild do.

3.8 Environmental Management (Pollution Prevention)

The Washington State Department of Ecology requires that users of hazardous substances and/or generators of hazardous wastes develop a Pollution Prevention Management Action Plan for their respective facilities. The FAFB Pollution Prevention (P2) plan has been developed and implemented to address the state requirement.

To implement the P2 program, several committees have been established including the Environmental Management subcommittee which oversees the hazardous waste/material minimization program, the Recycling Committee which manages the recycling program, and the Hazardous Material Management Process (HMMP) Team which ensures the base is meeting the requirements for proper management and tracking of hazardous materials. Pollution Prevention education and training is provided to all base personnel through a

variety of venues including newcomer's briefings, Airman Leadership School, and the base newspaper to name a few.

3.9 Environmental Justice

Federal Actions to "Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations" directs Federal agencies to address environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities. The general purposes of this Executive Order are:

- To focus attention of Federal agencies on the human health and environmental conditions in minority communities and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice;
- To foster non-discrimination in Federal programs that substantially affect human health or the environment; and
- To give minority communities and low-income communities greater opportunities for public participation in and access to public information on matters relating to human health and the environment.

There are no minority populations or low-income populations in the area of the proposed actions or alternatives.

3.10 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

Additional activities occurring during the same time period as the proposed action include, but are not limited to, taxiway and ramp area refurbishment work, and the front gate/Rambo road gate project.

4.0 Environmental Consequences

4.1 Introduction

This section describes the anticipated environmental consequences, on the affected environment, of implementing the proposed action and no-action alternative.

4.2 Air Quality

4.2.1 Proposed Action

The temporary deployment of 20 KC-135R aircraft, personnel, and associated activities resulting from aircraft operational support will undoubtedly result in a minor increase of air emissions. Overall, FAFB is located in an area designated as in attainment for all air quality standards and therefore a conformity determination is not required. In addition, FAFB air permits are sufficient to cover the temporary increase of air emissions from aircraft and personnel for the proposed time period.

The largest contribution to a decrease in air quality will be the emissions from personal vehicles. There are a number a reasons, however, why the additional emissions from personal vehicles will be negligent. First, the proposed action occurs during spring, summer, and fall months when vehicles operate more efficiently due to the increase in ambient air temperature. Secondly, FAFB operates an aggressive commute trip reduction (CTR) program. The CTR program encourages all base personnel to consider alternative transportation mechanisms, such as vanpool, carpool, bicycling, and the bus as opposed to the traditional single-occupancy vehicle. In addition, since Grand Forks personnel will be billeted on or close to the base, the vehicle miles traveled will be minimized. The CTR program will be briefed to all incoming 319th ARW personnel. Aircraft maintenance will contribute to air emissions but since the aircraft are identical to those already located at FAFB, the maintenance procedures and hazardous materials utilized will be the same. The short duration of the deployment should result in only minor impacts to air quality. In summary, the short term duration of the deployment will not result in any adverse impacts to air quality.

4.2.2 No-action Alternative

No-action will result in things remaining as they currently are for FAFB. FAFB will continue to operate in compliance with all air permits with minimal impact to air quality.

4.3 Noise

4.3.1 Proposed Action

Aircraft operations are the primary sources of noise at FAFB. Noise from aircraft engine run-up, landing, and takeoff occur mainly during normal business hours, from 0700 to 1700. Additional sources of noise that occur on FAFB during periods of no flying or maintenance operations include construction activity and ground traffic movement. This noise is comparable to sounds that occur in typical communities and it is only during periods of aircraft activity that the ambient noise level environment changes.

The proposed action will result in a temporary increase in aircraft operation noise levels, but no increase in decibel will occur because the same model of aircraft already operates at FAFB. The surrounding community will not be adversely impacted with the increased sorties flown and in addition, the local community, the City of Airway Heights, exists adjacent to Spokane IAP. Total sorties and noise impacts will be minimal when compared against the current AICUZ plan. Again, the land immediately surrounding FAFB is primarily agriculture.

4.3.2 No-action Alternative

The existing noise levels and AICUZ impact would remain the same with this alternative. FAFB would not receive the additional 20 aircraft from GFAFB and would continue the current operations under the existing AICUZ plan.

4.4 Waste and Hazardous Materials

4.4.1 Proposed Action

The temporary deployment of 20 KC-135R aircraft, personnel, and associated activities resulting from aircraft operational support will result in an increase of hazardous materials used to maintain the additional aircraft and an increase in the associated hazardous waste generated. The increase in use of hazardous materials and hazardous waste generation will not be a major impact, as FAFB complies with all associated local, state, and federal regulations. Maintenance of the GFAFB aircraft will be integrated in the existing FAFB aircraft maintenance program. Hazardous materials will be purchased through FAFB's "pharmacy" program utilizing existing hazardous material authorizations. Hazardous waste generated from GFAFB aircraft maintenance will be collected at existing satellite accumulation points until it is brought to the Hazardous Waste Facility for proper disposal.

4.4.2 No-action Alternative

No-action will result in things remaining as they currently are for FAFB. FAFB will continue to operate in compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations.

4.5 Socioeconomic Resources

4.5.1 Proposed Action

The proposed temporary relocation of aircraft from Grand Forks AFB would result in a positive impact on the local economy in the vicinity of FAFB. The total number of personnel to be temporarily relocated to FAFB under this action is 425 personnel. FAFB is the largest contributor to the local economy, and the addition of 425 personnel will provide even more input to industries, including real estate and services. Short-term beneficial impacts would result from the temporary personnel patronage of local services. Personnel will acquire lodging on and off base.

4.5.2 No-action Alternative

FAFB will continue to be the largest contributor to the local economy, but the temporary, positive impact from the proposed alternative would not materialize.

4.6 Airspace/Airfield Operations

4.6.1 Proposed Action

Current airspace/aircraft operations would increase as a result of the proposed action. FAFB is authorized to operate under Class C airspace with the number of sorties identified in the AICUZ and in close coordination with Spokane IAP. The increase in airspace use and airspace operations will not have a major impact, as FAFB is authorized and has operated under conditions similar to what would occur with the proposed action. The increase in airspace use from sortie operations and increase in overall airfield operations is not significant and would have no adverse impacts.

4.6.2 No-action Alternative

FAFB would continue to operate using current airspace/airfield operations. The number of planned sorties and types of airfield operations would remain the same.

4.7 Safety and Occupational Health

4.7.1 Proposed Action

The 92d Wing Safety Office, Ground Safety currently has a deployed Air Guardsman working in conjunction with them on a 120 MPA Mandy tour. The Safety Office would request a tour extension of 120 days for that person. It was recommended to the Grand Forks Safety Office that they consider deploying a Flight Safety Officer (FSO) or Flight Safety NCO (FSNCO) to assist with the increased work load of 20 additional aircraft.

4.7.2 No-action Alternative

The Safety Office would continue to operate in a normal manner. AFIs require that we provide assistance to TDY personnel when it is necessary, because we would be the closest permanent Safety Office to the Grand Forks TDY location

4.8 Environmental Management (Pollution Prevention)

4.8.1 Proposed Action

The proposed temporary deployment of aircraft from GFAFB to FAFB would result in increases to hazardous material use, hazardous waste generation, and solid waste generation, which will be tracked through existing systems utilized at FAFB. These increases will be properly noted and explained in the annual Pollution Prevention report to the Washington Department of Ecology. GFAFB will be required to follow FAFB procedures to minimize use of hazardous materials and hazardous waste generation. GFAFB personnel will participate in FAFB recycling programs to minimize the amount of solid waste disposal.

4.8.2 No-action Alternative

No-action will result in things remaining as they currently are for FAFB. FAFB will continue to operate in compliance with all air permits with minimal impact to air quality.

4.9 Environmental Justice

4.9.1 Proposed Action

Federal actions to “Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” directs federal agencies to address environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities. The general purposes of this Executive Order are:

- To focus attention of Federal agencies on the human health and environmental conditions in minority communities and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice;
- To foster non-discrimination in Federal programs that substantially affect human health or the environment; and
- To give minority communities and low-income communities greater opportunities for public participation in and access to public information on matters relating to human health and the environment.

The proposed project would have beneficial economic impacts on the surrounding community.

There are no minority or low-income populations in the area of the proposed actions or alternatives, and thus, there will be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts on such population. In compliance with Executive Order 12989 (Section 4.7), the alternatives considered for this EA do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

4.9.2 No-action Alternative

There would be no impacts to environmental justice with the no-action alternative.

4.10 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

4.10.1 Proposed Action

There are no site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with a temporary relocation of aircraft from GFAFB to FAFB.

4.10.2 No-action Alternative

There are no site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with the No-action alternative.

5.0 List of Preparers

Prepared by: Mr. Jonathan A. Wald
92 CES/CEVN
100 W. Ent Street, Suite 155
Fairchild AFB WA 99011
(509) 247-2313

6.0 List of Persons and Agencies Consulted and/or Provided Copies

Mr. Earl Albright	AMC/A75V	Scott AFB IL
Maj Brian M. Peake	92 ADS/SGGB	Fairchild AFB WA
Maj(s) Mark S. Watt	92 ARW/JA	Fairchild AFB WA
Ms. Diane Strom	391 CES/CEVA	Grand Forks AFB ND
Mr. Andrew Verdi	319 th ARW/XPO	Grand Forks AFB ND
Ms. Mary Baker	92 CES/CERR	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Marc Connally	92 CES/CEVR	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Joel Espinoza	92 CES/CEV	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. John Gibson	92 CES/CECP	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Gerald Johnson	92 CES/CEV	Fairchild AFB WA
Ms. Kristin Nester	92 CES/CEVC	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Rick Rosa	92 CES/CEV	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Mark Rupert	92 ARW/SEG	Fairchild AFB WA
Mr. Jonathan Wald	92 CES/CEVN	Fairchild AFB WA

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Upper Columbia Fish and Wildlife Office
11103 East Montgomery Drive
Spokane WA 99206

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

8702 North Division
Spokane WA 99218

Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority

1101 W. College, Suite 403
Spokane Washington 99201

Spokane County – Department of Building and Planning

Public Works Building
1026 W. Broadway Avenue

Spokane WA 99260

City of Spokane – Planning Services Department

City Hall
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane Washington 99201-3329

City of Airway Heights – Planning Division

P.O. Box 969
Airway Heights WA 99001